



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,547	09/27/2000	Seshadri Sathyanarayan	042390.P9328	8296

7590 10/09/2002

Kurt P Leyendecker
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
7th Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MERILYN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/671,547	SATHYANARAYAN, SESHADRI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marilyn P Nguyen	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 - 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 - 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
- Disposition of Claims**
- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 - 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 - 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
 - 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 - 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledges

Receipt is acknowledged of the following items from the Applicant:

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on 09/27/2000 and made of record as Paper No. 2.

The references cited on the PTO 1449 form have been considered.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

At page 6, line 1, “is it limited”, should be “it is limited” instead.

“Summary of the invention” is missing.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: “result entries the based” (line 7) should be “result entries based”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities: “search result entries by,” (line 9) should be “search result entries by:” Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 8-14, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Drucker (US 6,292,796).

Regarding claim 1, Drucker discloses a method comprising:

- transmitting a search query to a site (See Fig. 5, “query”, and col. 9, lines 26-28) over a network (See Fig. 12, reference 1221);
- receiving a search result document from the site, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries (See col. 9, lines 37-38); and
- filtering the plurality of search result entries (See col. 8, lines 10-17 and col. 9, lines 38-51) by:
 - comparing each search result entry with the search query (See col. 9, lines 38-40), and
 - selecting a subset of the plurality of search result entries based on the comparison (See col. 9, lines 38-40).

Regarding claim 2, Drucker further discloses:

- generating a summary document comprised of the subset of the plurality of search result entries (See col. 10, lines 3-5); and
- displaying the summary document (See col. 9, line 57 to col. 10 line 20).

Regarding claim 8, Drucker discloses wherein the network comprises the Internet (See Fig. 12, internet 1225), and the site comprises a World Wide Web site (See col. 10, lines 23-25).

9 Regarding claim 9, Drucker discloses wherein the search query is tailored to search requirements of the site (See col. 9, lines 26-28 and lines 19-25).

Regarding claim 10, Drucker discloses wherein each search result entry is associated with a document (See col. 10, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 11, Drucker discloses wherein said comparing each search result entry includes:

- parsing at least a portion of the search entry result into constituent elements (See col. 9, lines 40-45);
- comparing the constituent elements of the search result entry to elements of the search query (See col. 9, lines 38-43).

Regarding claim 12, Drucker discloses wherein each search result entry is associated with a document (See col. 10, lines 18-19) and includes a text link to the associated document (See col. 8, lines 42-46 and col. 10, lines 21-25).

Regarding claim 13, Drucker discloses wherein the at least a portion of the search result entry comprises the text link (See col. 10, lines 21-25).

Regarding claim 14, Drucker discloses wherein the at least a portion of the search result includes a description of an associated document (See col. 10, lines 12-14 and lines 36-39).

Regarding claim 18, Drucker discloses a machine-readable medium (See Fig. 12, mass storage 1212) containing instructions stored thereon (See col. 14, lines 42-44), which when executed cause a processor to:

- construct a plurality of queries comprising words for a plurality of predetermined sites (See Fig. 5, query construction and col. 9, lines 19-32);
- transmit the plurality of queries to the plurality of predetermined sites over a network connection (See Fig. 5, “Query”, and col. 9, lines 26-28);
- receive a plurality of documents (See Fig. 5, “Results”) from the plurality of predetermined sites via network connection (See col. 9, line 28, “libraries or databases”),

each document of the plurality of documents (See col. 9, lines 37-38) comprised of one or more search result entries, each search result entry of the one or more search result entries comprising a href link to a site (See col. 10, lines 12-14);

- compare at least a portion of each of the one or more search result entries from each document with an applicable query of the plurality of queries (See col. 9, lines 37-51);
- select search result entries based on the comparison (See Fig. 5, results filtering 510, and col. 9, 38-40); and
- construct a document comprising the selected search result entries (See col. 9, lines 60-63).

Regarding claim 19, Drucker discloses wherein the network connection (See Fig. 12, reference 1221) comprises a connection to the Internet (See Fig. 12, internet 1225).

Regarding claim 20, Drucker discloses generate the plurality of queries based at least partly on the user's profile (See col. 7, lines 37-39, and col. 17, lines 7-10).

Regarding claim 21, Drucker discloses generate the plurality of queries based at least partly on the content of the sites visited during an Internet session (See col. 17, lines 34-37).

Regarding claim 22, Drucker discloses wherein the at least a portion of each of the one or more search entries comprises the href link (See col. 10, lines 12-14).

Regarding claim 23, Drucker discloses computer system comprising:

- a processor (See Fig. 12, processor 1213) ;
- a network connection (See Fig. 12, network link 1221);
- storage medium (See Fig. 12, mass storage 1212) containing thereon stored instructions (See col. 14, lines 42-44) which when executed cause the processor to:

- a) transmitting a search query to a site (See Fig. 5, "query", and col. 9, lines 26-28) over a network (See Fig. 12, reference 1221);
- b) receiving a search result document from the site, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries (See col. 9, lines 37-38); and
- c) filtering the plurality of search result entries (See col. 8, lines 10-17 and col. 9, lines 38-51) by:
 - o comparing each search result entry with the search query (See col. 9, lines 38-40), and
 - o selecting a subset of the plurality of search result entries based on the comparison (See col. 9, lines 38-40).

Regarding claim 24, Drucker discloses wherein the stored instructions which when executed further cause the processor to:

- generating a summary document comprised of the subset of the plurality of search result entries (See col. 10, lines 3-5); and
- displaying the summary document (See col. 9, line 57 to col. 10 line 20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drucker (US 6,292,796).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 15, Drucker discloses:

- monitoring a user's Internet session (See col. 14, lines 21-26);
- determining the intent of the user by performing an analysis on the parsed words (See col. 12, lines 7-15);
- constructing queries to perform searches on a plurality of web sites based on the user's intent (See col. 9, lines 22-25); and
- transmitting the queries to the plurality of web sites (See col. 20, lines 1-22).

However, he is silent as to teaching the step of:

- parsing hypertext links selected by the user into words;

Although, Drucker is silent as to having the step of parsing hypertext links, on the other hand, he discloses the step of parsing the standing search (See col. 11, lines 36-37 and col. 12, lines 5-7), which may be entered as a natural language request (See col. 11, lines 25-30), to extract key words (See col. 12, lines 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply this concept of parsing to parse hypertext links into words. The motivation would have been to making the Drucker system more feasible and satisfying in term of user intent.

Regarding claim 17, Drucker discloses wherein the plurality of web sites are predetermined (See col. 9, line 28, Drucker et al.).

Claims 3-7, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drucker (US 6,292,796), in view of Herz (US 6,029,195).

Regarding claim 3, Drucker discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above and further discloses generating the query (See col. 9, lines 26-28) based on the intent of user (See

Art Unit: 2171

col. 9, lines 22-25). However, Drucker is silent as to generating the query based on the intent of user as indicated by computer usage. On the other hand, Herz et al. discloses computer usage (See col. 7, line 66 to col. 8, line 2, Herz et al.), which is used to determine the intent of the user; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to generate the query based on the intent of user as indicated by computer usage as suggested by Herz et al. The motivation would have been to making the system more efficient by filtering out unwanted results, for example, filtering out documents the user already read.

Regarding claim 4, Drucker, in view of Herz, discloses wherein said generating the query comprises:

- monitoring computer usage (See col. 18, lines 25-28, Herz et al.);
- recording information related to the monitoring (See col. 65, lines 50-63, Herz et al.);
- analyzing the information to determine the user's intent (See col. 7, lines 4-12, Herz et al.); and
- constructing the query based on the user's intent (See col. 7, lines 14-16, Herz et al.).

Regarding claim 5, Drucker, in view of Herz, discloses wherein said generating the query includes:

- monitoring the text links chosen by the user (See col. 7, lines 36-40, Herz. et al.);
- determining the intent of the user based on the content of the text links using heuristics (See col. 7, lines 19-22 and 29-35, Herz et al.); and
- constructing the query based on the user's intent (See col. 9, lines 19-25, Drucker et al.).

Regarding claim 6, Drucker, in view of Herz, discloses wherein said generating the query is in response to a user action (See col. 9, lines 22-26, Drucker et al.) and is based on the content of an item or a document currently being displayed (See col. 75, lines 27-43, Herz et al.).

Regarding claim 7, Drucker, in view of Herz, discloses wherein the computer usage monitored includes, but is not limited to:

- a) text links chosen by the user (See col. 7, lines 36-44, and col. 18, lines 25-27, Herz et al.);
- b) time spent at each site and/or time spent on each page (See col. 18, lines 27-28 and 33-38, Herz et al.);
- c) pages bookmarked by the user (See col. 62, lines 60-62, Herz et al.);
- d) frequency that particular pages are visited (See col. 9, lines 45-48, Drucker et al.);
- e) the content of visited pages (See col. 65, lines 50-51, Herz et al.);
- f) the content of text links (See col. 10, lines 12-14, Drucker et al.).

Regarding claim 16, Drucker, in view of Herz, discloses wherein the analysis uses a heuristic method (See col. 20, lines 1-22, Herz et al.).

Regarding claim 25, Drucker, in view of Herz, discloses wherein the stored instructions which when executed further cause the processor to generate the query based on the intent of user as indicated by computer usage as set forth above in claim 3.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kravets U.S Patent No. 6,363,377 discloses search data processor.

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MN
October 1, 2002



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100